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Another Development (AD) is a Myanmar local think thank which is a not-for-profit organization. It was set up to be part of the solution to the problems and conflicts prevailing in Myanmar by advocating effecting public policy change.

Another Development’s initial engagement in Ngayokekaung began following a request from local people in June 2017. No other NGO had been working in the area but there is a published research on Marine Biology research conducted by a professor from Pathein University in collaboration with a local fishery group.

For over a year so far, AD has been providing technical assistance for the development of community-based tourism there after the community decided they would like to pursue that initiative. AD conducted a research assessment; organized training workshops; set up meetings to establish CBT working groups; explained the policy frameworks for CBT; took Ngayokekaung residents on exposure trips to different CBT initiatives around the country to learn from other experiences; carried out a visitor survey; oversaw the construction of an Information Center; engaged a photographer to produce publicity materials, and met regional government officials to discuss and support CBT initiatives. Details of each activity that AD has carried out for the development of CBT in Ngayokekaung are documented in the following report.

There are some CBT initiatives in-country where International Non-Governmental Organizations (INGOs) have been helping the local community for many years. In similar fashion, the community in Ngayokekaung seems to expect somebody else to finance and work for them. While there are indeed practical challenges for the local community in initiating CBT such as land tenure rights; a lack of business licenses to provide accommodation for visitors; poor basic infrastructure; no access to financial assistance to start small enterprises, nevertheless all these challenges could be overcome with support from regional government.

AD recognizes that its own expertise in environmental issues was at an insufficient level to ask all the necessary questions and has put forward the need to do mangrove forest research as well as educate the community more profoundly in conservation methods. In the remaining months while AD completes its assistance to Ngayokekaung in December 2017, there will be opportunities to raise our concerns with the community and to reiterate that we are not an implementing NGO, but a public policy institute. We have noticed that the usual patterns of older male domination in senior committee positions persist and that traditionally under-represented groups like women and young people continue to be marginalized. In addition, all the work is being done by a small group of activists. Our hope is that issues will be acknowledged in the community but we also believe they epitomize bigger challenges for civil society organizations working with communities across Myanmar, we expect to share this information with NGO networks and policy-makers at regional and national level.
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1. Introduction

Since 2012, Myanmar has emerged as a fast-growing tourist destination and the number of international visitors has increased significantly year on year, according to figures released by the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism.¹ In 2012, over 1 million international visitors came to Myanmar: 30 percent more than in 2011. The total income generated by the tourism industry in that same year was USD 543 million, while in it had been USD 319 million in 2011. By 2015, the total income from tourism activity dramatically rose to USD 2,122 million² and 4.68 million international visitors arrived.³ The World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC) predicts that the tourism industry of Myanmar will be ranked second out of 184 countries for long-term growth and 15th globally in 2016. Besides, the contribution of tourism sector to Myanmar’s GDP for 2016 is forecast at 5.9 percent and thereafter, 7.8 percent annually until 2026.⁴ In other words, tourism in Myanmar has the potential to increase in the coming years and the role it plays could have a huge impact on the country’s economic development as well as alleviating poverty.

While Myanmar already has many tourist attractions spots around the country which receive international visitors, the new government is exploring potential future destinations for visitors. One of those included in the government’s agenda is Gaw Yan Gyi Island.⁵ Located in Ngayokekaung, Ayeyawaddy region, it is renowned for its beautiful and pristine islands as the number of domestic travellers to the area in the 2015 tour season attest. In 2014, notwithstanding its natural beauty, a coal-powered plant was planned for the Ngayokekaung area by the Ministry of Electric Power, in cooperation with a consortium of Japanese companies and India-based Tata Group. The project was supposed to cover around 200 acres which would have meant the loss of farmland, dislocation of the local community and harm to the environment.⁶ The local community collectively voiced their concern and lobbied strongly against the project and eventually, it was suspended by the authorities. Subsequently, Ngayokekaung people, mobilized by local community organizations and leaders, proposed community-based tourism (CBT) as a way of conserving nature, the unspoilt environment as well as preserving the region’s cultural heritage, and consequently promoting the livelihood of the local residents through CBT. Thus, this preliminary study was conducted by Another Development team in collaboration with two community-based organizations, namely: Beautiful Beach Development Network (BBDN) and Western Coastline Ayeyawaddy Environmental Conservation Group (WCAECG).

¹ Policy on community involvement tourism (CIT).
⁴ Ibid
⁵ http://www.moi.gov.mm/moi:eng/?q=news/6/05/2016/id-6943
1.1 Brief History of Ngayokekaung

Ngayokekaung (meaning Pepper) was so named because a very large chili plant used to grow at the lake to the east of the village. Ngayokekaung sub-township status was granted on 1 April, 2004 by the Home Affairs Ministry under Statement No. 100/22 – 358/U 1 and Ngayokekaung Township under Statement No. 100/24-50/U 1.³

In Ngayokekaung Township, there are twelve village tracts with 68 villages; there are 887 households with 804 houses inside the township while there are 7,907 households with 7,275 houses in the surrounding villages. The total population is 41,194; divided into 37,938 rural and 3,256 urban according to the Ayeyawaddy Region Census report of 2014.

Ngayokekaung is situated in the western part of Myanmar at Ngapudaw Township, Pathein District, Ayeyawaddy Region. It is 883 square miles. It is bordered by the Rakhine Yoma mountain range in the east, the Bay of Bengal to the west, Hygyi Island in the south and Ngwe Saung in the north. It is made up of mountain ranges, islands and farmland. The highest point is Mt. Tawngpatgyi which is 250 ft. above sea level. There are a number of rivers flowing from the Rakhine Yoma range: the Thea Phyu; Thit Yaung; Hpa Yar Chaung; Sin Hmon; Ngayokekaung; Boke Pin Seik; Sa Par Gyi; Ngan Chaung and Than Ban Lay rivers. It is abundant in mangrove ecosystems and wetlands while it also has a rich biodiversity both marine and land- based. Sadly, there is widespread deforestation due to legal and illegal logging. There are reserved forests in the Rakhine Yoma Range: Sin Hmon, Sin Ma Thit and Myittayar Reserved Forests.

2. Overview

This section discusses the literature on community-based tourism. The chapter is divided into three parts: the first describes the concept of CBT including its five aspects; the second describes the current CBT situation in Myanmar; the third explains government policy on CBT and it elaborates nine aims to implement it.

2.1 The Concept of Community-Based Tourism

Community-based tourism appeared as an alternative to mainstream tourism. While CBT is largely dependent upon the same tourism infrastructure as mainstream tourism, particularly

---

³ Socioeconomic statistics of Ngayokekaung by Japan Consortium Group, 2014
for transport, and very few CBT initiatives are connected to the mainstream tourism industry and the market access of CBT projects is therefore generally poor. Associated with this rejection of the market is a commitment to collective community benefit and community governance. However, the research by the Rainforest Alliance suggests that while 60% of CBT projects in developing countries do involve some form of community engagement in decision-making but 40% do not.8

Community-based tourism can be defined as tourism owned and/or managed by communities and intended to deliver wider community benefit. WWF defined it as a form of tourism “where the local community has substantial control over, and involvement in, its development and management, and a major proportion of the benefits remain within the community.” WWF recognized that the concept of community depends on local “social and institutional structures” and accepted that it “must also embrace individual initiatives within the community”.9 CBT is intended as a tool for holistic community development (i.e. one that incorporates a complete range of social, cultural, economic, environment and political development factors), to analyze the community context. Understanding the community situation will help the project implementer maximize the capacity for CBT to act as an effective and sustainable community development strategy.

Figure 1: Five Aspects of CBT

Community-Based Tourism

Social
- People-centered development
- Social justice
- Satisfying quality of life
- Active community organizations
- Social inclusion of often-marginalized groups

Cultural
- Cultural Preservation
- Passing local culture to the next generation
- Exchange between different cultures
- Encouraging respect for other cultures

Economic
- Income from local production
- Diversified local economy
- Self-reliance

Political
- Community Participation
- Development in response to the community needs
- Democratization

Environmental
- Natural resources conservation
- Environmental Responsibility
- Natural resources Management Rights

8 Ibid
2.2. CBT in Myanmar

In Myanmar, CBT is not yet well known and it is a very new concept to the people of Myanmar. CBT is tourism that takes social, cultural, economic, political and environmental sustainability into account. It is owned and managed by the local community, for the community, with the purpose of enabling visitors to increase their awareness about the community and the local way of life. In order to be in line with the above descriptions, the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism has scheduled five CBT projects across the country. The project areas include the Pa-O Self-Administered Zone in Shan State, Indawgyi Lake in Kachin State, Thandaunggyi in Kayin State, the Irrawaddy Dolphin Sanctuary in Mandalay Region and Demawso in Kayah State.

Community-based tourism projects are also meant to provide local residents with job opportunities to alleviate poverty. A five-year scheme for human resource development in the tourism sector is being implemented co-operatively with the Luxembourg Agency for Development Cooperation and the Ministry. The first CBT project was established in Myaing Township near Bagan by ActionAid Myanmar. Then, Community Involved Tourism Pa-O Region and Fauna and Flora International started projects in the Pa-O Self-Administered Zone and at Indawgyi Lake respectively. Finally, Peace Nexus, World Conservation Society and the International Trade Centre supported the Thandaunggyi, Irrawaddy Dolphin Conservation and Demawso projects, respectively. Another seven community-based tourism projects are also planned in Myanmar and will be initiated in the coming years.¹⁰

2.3. Government Policy on Tourism

The Ministry of Hotels and Tourism (MoHT) and the Myanmar Tourism Federation (MTF) highlight that the principle of increased involvement of local communities in tourism development is laid out in existing ministerial policies. In particular, the Myanmar Responsible Tourism Policy of 2012 repeatedly states the inclusion of local communities in its Aims 1 and 2:

Aim 1: Tourism is a national priority sector. Integrate domestic and international tourism into the national economic policy and develop linkages between tourism and other economic sectors to maximize benefits. Further strengthen cooperation mechanisms within the public sector and with the various tourism sector stakeholders (private sector, local communities and civil society).

Aim 2: Broad-based local social-economic development. Spread benefits in the community, encourage local entrepreneurship and civil society engagement to secure livelihoods for women and youth and alleviate poverty.

Aim 3: Maintain cultural diversity and authenticity. Preserve national identity and encourage the development of cultural heritage and living cultures.

Aim 7: Institutional strengthening to manage tourism. Enhance the understanding and effective management of tourism at a local to national level and work with stakeholders in destinations.

¹⁰ Eleven Myanmar (17.2.2016). Five community-based tourism projects underway
Aim 8: A well trained and rewarded workforce. Establish an adequate and appropriate capacity building program through continuing professional development, training and education.

Aim 9: Minimizing unethical practices. Apply ethical standards through tourism development to minimize social, economic and environmental harm.

Aims 3, 7, 8 and 9 are also directly or indirectly related to community involvement in tourism as they focus on cultural heritage, networking and stakeholder processes, capacity building and social safeguards.

In line with the above statements, the Ministry of Hotels and Tourism is encouraged to create favorable conditions to work with communities by giving them market power and by allowing the private sector higher investment security and greater incentives for partnerships. It is suggested that members of local communities, even those not directly involved in tourism enterprises, can gain more benefits through the establishment of a community fund; visitors would be requested to pay a certain amount of money into the community fund which will be used by the community for community activities only.

Although Myanmar ratified the ASEAN Homestay Standards in 2010, the promotion of Bed and Breakfasts (B&Bs) is recommended due to local customs and for religious reasons. Communities are able to gain first-hand experiences with village B&B’s which may enable them to run homestay programs in the long term.  

2.4. Case Studies of Community-Based Tourism in Cambodia and Thailand

Cambodia

Banteay Chhmar is located in Banteay Meanchey Province in Cambodia surrounded by 14 small villages, and is approximately 50km from the provincial capital, Sisophon (Svay). Since Banteay Chhmar is isolated from other townships, the people in this area manage their own crops, and supply their needs from within the community. They grow fruit, vegetables and rice for themselves, and cassava for export to Vietnam. The population is nearly 13,500, and most of them are Buddhists. Due to persistent civil war until 1996 and its geographical isolation, Banteay Chhmar is less developed than other townships. The main temple complex and satellite temples in the center of the township, which could be attractions for tourists was in ruins after the civil war. The facilities are inadequate: with a lack of running water and limited access to electricity, they rely on rainwater and batteries. The older generation has low ability in literacy and numeracy.

The French NGO Agir Pour Le Cambodge (APLC) launched a CBT program in 2006, aiming at distributing benefit equally to villagers. It provided hospitality training to improve accommodation and food and beverage services to people in the area. Also, Cambodian Community-Based Ecotourism Network (CCBEN) connects the community to other NGOs which provide training such as capacity building and language training. Their major attractions are the temples, and their traditional and rural lifestyle, such as silk weaving, dal ombok (food), ox cart and kuyon rides, traditional music and dancing. The people

11 Ministry of Hotels and Tourism: Policy on Community Involvement in Tourism, Pg 8-10
of Banteay Chhmar provide homestays and local cuisine made from local and seasonal ingredients. However, in 2008, APLC unexpectedly had to leave this CBT project due to a shortage of funds. Without APLC, the CBT committee in Banteay Chhmar had to become more independent. Since 2009 it has received financial aid for repairing the main temple complex from another NGO, Global Heritage Fund (GHF), and skill training from CCBEN. These funds are distributed to the committee and homestays, and used to improve facilities for tourists.

The CBT projects had various positive effects on Banteay Chhmar in economic, social, cultural and environmental dimensions. Their income increased because of tourism. Besides this, social development was observed through CBT projects such as improvement in water and sanitary system and opportunities for education. Additionally, CBT created job opportunities within the community, which limited the number of people leaving home for a job. As a cultural benefit, CBT encouraged villagers to preserve their ancient temples and traditional practices including music and food. Finally, tourism triggered people's incentive to clean moats and to collect garbage in temple areas.

**Thailand**

Ban Talae Nok meaning “village by the sea” is between a mountain and the Andaman Sea with a population of 200, mainly Muslim villagers. The village has natural mangroves on the North Andaman side. Livelihoods in the village largely depend on fishing, rubber tapping and palm oil farming.

The tsunami in 2004 killed around 50 villagers and destroyed 20 villages including the one which was planning tourism at that time in Ban Talae Nok. After the disaster, North Andaman Tsunami Relief (NATR) provided aid to the region to recover. Later, NATR became a non-profit organization, Andaman Discoveries (AD) which supports local tourism in Thailand. In 2006, Andaman Discoveries started a community based tourism project in Ban Talae Nok. In 2014, 9 out of 67 households hosted homestays, and other families participated as guide or hosts for other activities in the tour. The tour includes traditional soap making, beach fishing, hiking in the mangrove Thai cooking lessons, and cultural exchanges. As a tour agency, AD leads tourists to Ban Talae Nok and helps to plan and book trips.

In 2008, the Tourism Authority of Thailand (TAT) presented the silver Kinnaree Award to the Eco Tourism Club of Ban Talae Nok for their outstanding CBT performance. An observation team from TAT evaluated the village concerning environmental stewardship, society participation, economic improvement, proper management, and responsibility to society.

Regarding the outcomes, villagers are aware of a supplement to their income from tourism. Moreover, CBT improved the village’s solidarity, pride and organization through decision-making based on local practice and prices. There were minor conflicts in the local community, but they were resolved. Describing their culture to tourists enhances the knowledge about their own culture and heritage. Surprisingly, villagers think that the CBT project has a positive influence on the village’s environment. Tourists’ environmentally-conscious behaviors such as collection of garbage make the local people more considerate to nature.
3. Research Methodology

A qualitative research approach was applied to the study in order to have insight information and produce accurate results. Focus group discussions (FGD) and Key Informant Interviews (KII) with semi-structure questionnaires were used for data collection. For the recruitment of participants, a purposive sampling method was adopted and selection criteria for the participation of focus group discussion were also established. In total, 19 FGDs and 31 KIIIs were conducted for the study.

3.1. Participants

Participants for the group discussions were local residents from different villages across the Ngayokekaung area. They were recruited through the two local community-based organizations namely Beautiful Beach Development Network (BBDN) and Western Coastline Ayeyawaddy Environmental Conservation group (WCAECG). Key Informant Interviews were conducted with respected people and leaders, village administrators, regional public servants, real estate brokers, hostel owners and visitors. Female participation in the study was equal to that of male.

3.2. Procedure

Prior to the focus group discussions and key informant interviews, full information about the study was shared with all participants and their voluntary consent was requested before proceeding to discussion and interview. Participants were told that all the information they provided would be kept confidential and would not be used for other purposes. Both FGDs and KIIIs were conducted in June 2016 in Ngayokekaung, in the Burmese language. Note-taking and audio-taping were done during the discussions and interviews.

3.3. Analysis

For the data analysis, a content analysis approach was applied. A coding table was developed for each ‘aspect’ of discussion and one to one interviews. Reading and re-reading of the interview scripts was done and the respondents’ quotes were reproduced to support the findings of the study.

4. Objective, Scope and Limitations of the study

The core objective of this study is to conduct research assessment on community-based tourism initiatives in Ngayokekaung area and thereby produce a CBT study paper for the local community. In addition, the findings of the study are intended for presentation to the regional government with a view to budget allocation in order to support the implementation of the CBT project in Ngayokekaung area.

The socio-economic situation of people living in Ngayokekaung; land ownership and legal documentation; environmental conditions; township infrastructure; significant destinations and heritage in the area and local residents’ perspectives on CBT were the focus areas of this feasibility study. The data collection period was relatively short and not all stakeholders were able to be included in this study due to their time constraints and the difficulty of transportation within the area.
5. Findings

5.1. Socio-economic situation of local people in Ngayokekaung

The main sources of income for local people living in Ngayokekaung Township is from fishing and farming. Location determines which of these provides employment. Less than half of FGD groups responded that the number of local people working on paddy fields was higher than those working in the fishing sector. One of the FGD participants said the following:

“Farming and fishing are the main livelihood activities for the local people in this village. Generally speaking, those working on farming is about 75 per cent and fishing is about 25 per cent. Both farming paddy and fishing are run as a small business for the local people to generate income”.

The majority of FGD groups mentioned that fishing was the main source of income generation for local people and few were working on farming and gardening. Regarding this, one of the FGD participants commented on the situation:

“90 percent of the villagers earn their income from the fishing industry and only 10 per cent of the local people in this village depend on farming paddy to generate income”.

One of the KII interviewees with the local authority also affirmed that fishing was the primary sector that local people in Ngayokekaung worked in for their living and that farming was a secondary livelihood activity. For the majority of local people, fishing acts as a small business for their individual household. The following representative quote is from one of the KII respondents:

“Fishing is the primary source of income generation for the majority of local people living in Ngayokekaung area. However, local residents in Ngayokekaung area run the fishery as a small business for their income”.

Some participants mentioned that they worked at both farm and garden land for the production of paddy and other locally grown products such as beans, coconuts and cashew. Fish-paste and dried
fish are produced across the area. Seasonal fruit and vegetables are also grown in the area. Some of the local products produced from the fishery and farming sector are sold to Pathein and Yangon to increase earnings. However, only a small business operation pattern is found and mostly run by individuals. Local residents are unable to sell their products due to the lack of good transportation in the area. One of the participants from FGD groups explained the situation as follow:

“Locally grown crops, fruits and vegetables are not sold outside Ngayokekaung area because of the poor road condition and lack of good transportation. The price of the local products could be higher and even be sold to other part of Ayeyawaddy region if the transport system of Ngayokekaung area is good enough”.

The majority of KII participants said their average monthly income is between 150,000 MMK and 250,000 MMK.

5.2. Land Ownership

With regards to land ownership, almost all of the local people are experiencing difficulty. In Ngayokekaung, there are different categories of tenure: freehold land; ancestral land; vacant land; low land; paddy and garden land. The following quote is from a local authority KII with regarding land types in the area.

“Reserved forest is administered by the Forest Department. The General Administrative Department (GAD) is responsible for pasture. And the rest of the land cases are the task of the Land Records Department: Paddy land\textsuperscript{12}; Garden land\textsuperscript{12}; Nipa Palm land\textsuperscript{14} and Alluvial Land\textsuperscript{15} are mainly found in Ngayokekaung area”.

\textsuperscript{12} The land on which water for cultivation is retained and mainly paddy is cultivated.
\textsuperscript{13} The land on which perennial plants are cultivated e.g. mango and orange orchards.
\textsuperscript{14} Nipa palms grown where tidal waves occur.
\textsuperscript{15} Impermanent cultivable land (island or cone-shaped sand shore) which emerges from the annual freshwater flow during the rainy season.
For paddy land, most of the FGD groups mentioned that almost all of the farmers have Form 7 which is a farmland work permit issued by the government. But only half of the FGD groups said that they have Form 105 which is a document issued by respective township Land Records Department.

With reference to garden land, local residents do not have any legal document for ownership but they do have a tax receipt for the use of garden land. In addition, all FGD groups and KII interviews mentioned that no legal document for the ownership of their dwelling was granted yet in Ngayokekaung Township but they would very much like to have it. One of the KII interviewee remarked:

“We do not have any legal document or grant for our home in the village and thus we want to have a valid document of ownership for our home from the government”.

Although land ownership in the area is complicated, land selling and buying occurs. Local people sell their land because they have financial difficulties and need to support their children’s schooling. Most of the FGD groups said 90 per cent of land in the village, which is close to the sea shore is already sold. The sales’ deal is made solely through local land brokers and the real land buyers are unknown. In some cases, it is said that the land brokers are clerks from Land Records Department.

Almost all of the FGD groups mentioned that people from across the country came and bought land which is close to the sea for building hotels. Fewer than half of FGD groups said they knew the reason for buying their land. One of the KII interview with a local land broker also highlighted the situation as the following:

“Land is bought for building hotels and recreational resorts. Land buyers are mostly
from Yangon and Mandalay. Either land buyers or their brokers come and buy the land in the village. The majority of the land in Kyway Chaing\(^{16}\) is already sold out”.

Land price varies from one village tract to another in Ngayokekaung area. One of the FGD participants explained as follows:

“Land price ranges from 100 lakh MMK to 2000 lakh MMK per acre depending on location and in which village the land is located. The closer the location to Gaw Yan Gyi Island, the higher the land price is”.

Land confiscation is rarely heard of in Ngayokekaung according to the majority of the FGD groups and KII participants.

---

“*We do not have any legal document or grant for our home in the village and thus we want to have a valid document of ownership for our home from the government*”.

---

### 5.3 Environmental conditions

The Ngayokekaung area has beautiful scenery: wide beaches: rocks and a variety of small islands. Different village tracts have different environments that are worth visiting. In addition, the area is also rich in mangrove ecosystems and wetlands. Animals such as elephant, different species of monkey and birds live in the area. However, there is logging by Myanmar Timber Enterprise and local residents cut down trees for firewood: it has become a problem for the area.

The consequences of deforestation are explained by one of the participants as follows:

“Local people experience environmental problems such as decreasing freshwater levels and water scarcity in some villages especially in March and April. Besides, not much wildlife can be found in the area anymore but sometimes some of them pop up in the villages and destroy the farms and even attack the villagers.”

Even the reserved forests namely Sin Mhone, Sin Ma and Myittayar were found to be lacking trees. The majority of the participants said 1975 cyclone was the most severe natural disaster that local people has encountered in the area while in 2006 cyclone Marlar hit the village and garden lands were damaged due to the flood. The following quote is taken from one of the FGD groups’ participant discussion.

“We experienced cyclones Pathein, Nargis and Marlar but no severe damage was caused and no one died.”

The majority of participants also mentioned they did not know whether natural resources such as gas and petrol exist or not in the area but some companies came to search for them. In addition, both FGD groups and KII participants agreed that the pollution of the beach was not too bad yet.

“We do not know exactly about the natural resources in the area but we notice that two or three companies are testing for natural resources. For the beach, it is very clean and no pollution is found so far. Very little rubbish and used cans and bottles are found on the shores.”

---

\(^{16}\) Kwai Chai is a village located next to Gaw Yan Gyi Island in Ngayokekaung area.
5.4. Infrastructure

The infrastructure is found to be weak in terms of transportation, communication, basic health care and education services. All FGD groups and KII participants said local people mainly relied on the road for their transportation. It is also pointed out that the roads are not accessible throughout the whole year. Particularly in the rainy season, transportation becomes difficult and delays travelling and the transportation of local products to be sold. One of the FGD group participants explained the means of transportation in the area as follow:

“Ngayokekaung area can be reached by motor bike and daily highway minibus via routes of Ngwe Saung – Ngayokekaung and Maw Tin – Ngayokekaung. Maw Tin – Ngayokekaung route can be used throughout the three seasons but Ngwe Saung- Ngayokekaung route is hardly used due to muddiness and poor condition of the road in rainy season. The travelling time and cost varies across Ngayokekaung region as well. Travelling with motor bike is costly in the rainy season for the local people.”

It was mentioned in all FGD groups that Ngwe Saung – Ngayokekaung highway route for transportation is better, shorter, safer and more convenient than Maw Tin-Ngayokekaung route because there

“We do not know exactly about the natural resources in the area but we notice that two or three companies are testing for natural resources. For the beach, it is very clean and no pollution is found so far. Very little rubbish and used cans and bottles are found on the shores.”
are villages along Ngwe Saung- Ngayokekaung route. The Maw Tin- Ngayokekaung route passes through the hill to get to Pathein and no village is found along the route. The KII interview with one of the local people discussed it as the following:

“As the Ngwe Saung route is shorter and more convenient for transportation, we want the route to be better. It takes only about 4 to 5 hours to get to Pathein, capital city of Ayeyawady region, from Ngayokekaung.”

All FGD groups and KII participants mentioned that the villages across Ngayokekaung area would benefit from Ngwe Saung – Ngayokekaung route if the road were accessible the whole year. One of the responses regarding the benefit of Ngwe Saung – Ngayokekaung route is quoted below:

“We will be able to sell and transport local grown products to other parts of the Ayeyawaddy region and can increase our income. Therefore, we want to have the Ngwe Saung- Ngayokekaung route to be a better road for our transportation and want to use it throughout the year.”

Regarding social services in Ngayokekaung Township, one of the FGD groups’ participants reflected the situation as the follow:

“Yes not every village in the area has schools and clinics. There is one high school that all students from Ngayokekaung area attend for high school education. In addition, there is one general hospital and only one medical doctor and a couple of nurses are serving for the whole township. Basic social services for the people living in Ngayokekaung are inadequate and even lacking in some villages.”

Community-supported middle schools and a village clinic are found in some villages. Electricity is mostly generated from solar energy. For communication, mobile network from Myanmar Post and Telecom (MPT) is available but the connection is sometimes poor and intermittent. Monastery and public schools are used for mass meetings and gatherings when it comes to discussing village matters and those places are also used as shelter when natural disasters like cyclones and floods hit.
5.5. Destinations and Heritage

In Ngayokekaung area, there are many attractive and clean beaches, rocky outcrops and variety of islands. Among them, Mi Gyaung Gaung (Crocodile Head) Island, Kyway Chai beach and Gaw Yan Gyi Island are the most attractive destinations for visitors in the area. In addition, there are other interesting places such as coral reefs, nesting areas and Nget Taung (a mountain with birds living inside) in other part of Ngayokekaung area. Due to the lack of good transportation, visitors are unable to get there yet. A variety of fish species are found and wide beaches are also good for visitors to experience the beauty of the area, there are several hills and trails which are good for hiking around. One of the FGD groups discussed as the following:

“Last year in 2015, hundreds of domestic visitors including foreign tourists visited Gaw Yan Gyi Island and its surrounding area for sightseeing and recreation. The majority of the visitors are from a different part of the country. Some international tourists also visited the area. The present destinations for visitors are Nget Taung, Bagan, Myauk Gyun Lay, Gaw Yan Gyi Islands.”

There are a number of local Festivals celebrated throughout the year. Among them, Mya San Taung Pagoda festival which lasts three days in March is the most well-known. The pagoda is located at Moe Tain Pyin village tract and is highly regarded by all villages in Ngayokekaung area. One of the participants mentioned as follows:

“San Taung Pagoda, 30 minutes’ drive from Ngayokekaung town, is also one of the significant places that many domestic visitors go to pay homage during their visit.”

The main traditional foods are locally-made fish paste curry, Monhinga and seafood.
“Last year in 2015, hundreds of domestic visitors including foreign tourists visited Gaw Yan Gyi Island and its surrounding area for sightseeing and recreation. The majority of the visitors are from a different part of the country. Some international tourists also visited the area. The present destinations for visitors are Nget Taung, Bagan, Myauk Gyun Lay, Gaw Yan Gyi Islands.”

5.5.1 Services

Although there was an influx of visitors last year, tourism related services are not provided adequately because it is the first time local people have seen a large number of tourists visiting their locality. The peak season is from early December till the end of March. The KII interview with a domestic visitor remarked on the situation of tourism related services in the area:

“Not many tourists will come and visit this place if the area is developed similarly to Ngwe Saung and Chaungtha. Hostel fees are expensive and no good food is served for visitors yet. Local people are not able to guide to the interesting places of the area.”

One of the KII interviewees who provides accommodation for the visitors mentioned their services charges as the following:

“We charge 45,000 MMK for a room per day. It can accommodate five persons and includes breakfast as well.”

Scenery at Gaw Yan yi (Photo-Rita/AD)
5.6. Perspectives on CBT

All FGD groups and KII interviewees agreed that it is plausible to initiate CBT in the area. They also thought that it could bring lots of advantages to the local people and community. The following representative quotes are the responses from FGD groups and KII interviews concerning the feasibility of CBT in the area.

“It is feasible to initiate community-based tourism (CBT) in the area. And job opportunities and stable income generation are the advantages of developing CBT in the area. The local development will also be improved through implementing CBT.”

“Good transportation system will be installed and local people will be able to transport their products to other part of area in Ayeyawaddy if CBT is successfully implemented. Local products will be sold with reasonable price as well. Electricity and road condition will be better.”

“Through CBT, migrant workers from the area will return home. Young people no longer need to go to the city in search of work. They can work here living together with their parents when CBT is implemented.”

“Both young people and women will get benefit from CBT. For women, they can sell local products to the visitors and young people can work at hotels and bungalows.”

Nearly all of FGD groups and KII interviews also stressed that they want to have environmentally-friendly tourism in the region so that the existing pristine natural environment would be conserved and protected. Unlike other tourist spots in the Ayeyawaddy region, the local people want to have a different sort of tourism initiative in the area. Participants also felt that implementing CBT would promote and protect the natural environment of the area. Regarding this, one of the participants from FGD group put it this way:

“The tourism initiatives that do protect the natural environment and protect the beach’s beauty are preferable. We prefer tourism that is different from Chaungtha and Ngwe Saung and do not want the situation like Chaungtha and Ngwe Saung. Thus, CBT will bring the advantage of conserving the natural environment.”

The involvement of business people, civil society and government are welcomed by all the participants in FGD groups and KII interviews. The way to get involved in CBT implementation was discussed and one of the responses was the following:

“Business, government and civil society should be involved in the CBT process, development and implementation. Business people play the role of building hotels and providing accommodation for the visitors but the hotels should be built far away from the beach. Since the government is the most responsible agency, we want the government to provide financial assistance and good transportation to the local community.”

“We cannot let the business people control all the businesses operated in the area and local people suffer. We want our local people to be involved in the management and decision-making process.”

“Both young people and women will get benefit from CBT. For women, they can sell local products to the visitors and young people can work at hotels and bungalows.”
The majority of the FGD groups mentioned that homestay was possible and they were willing to host visitors as the appropriate way for them to receive guests:

“It is acceptable if visitors want to do homestay. We can host visitors at our house. Homestay would be more relevant for local people.”
6. Analysis

Starting from the 2015 tour season, hundreds of visitors mainly domestic and some international, visited to Gaw Yan Gyi Island. Prior to that, the island and its surroundings has been just a part of the Ngayokekaung area located in Ayeyawaddy region. Due to the planned construction of a coal-powered plant in the area by the Ministry of Electrical Power in collaboration with Japanese and Indian companies, the area has come to be known for the collective action of local people against the project which stopped it from going ahead. Meanwhile, the beauty of the area particularly Gaw Yan Gyi Island and its scenery was revealed to people across the country on social media.

We know that there are some CBT activities already operating in the country but they all were initiated by International NGOs. CBT in Ngayokekaung is a different model and it has been initiated and proposed by the local community and its leaders. They are willing and enthusiastic about CBT which they think would bring advantages such as job opportunities and environmental conservation to the community. It is also very clear in the findings that local people are keen to develop CBT in the area.

The need to include local communities is repeatedly stated in the 2012 Myanmar Responsible Tourism Policy but the involvement of the local people in tourism is given only as medium level of participation in Community Involvement Tourism (CIT) policy. In addition, it is clearly stated in CIT that gaining substantial control over the development and management of tourism activities by the community members is its core aim (CIT, 2014). Thus, the regional government of Ayeyawaddy should promote CBT in Ngayokekaung in line with the CIT policy so that community members could have more participation in the planning process as well as in governance systems, thereby allowing the community to manage the CBT’s sustainability. Meanwhile, the national government has identified the Gaw Yan Gyi Island as a potential tourism destination and thus the regional government will need to support the development of CBT in Ngayokekaung area.

Table 1: Visitors to Chaung Tha and Ngwe Saung

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan- Dec, 2013</th>
<th>Local Visitors</th>
<th>Foreign Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chaung Tha</td>
<td>243,050</td>
<td>4,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ngwe Saung</td>
<td>30,819</td>
<td>8,927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan- Dec, 2015</th>
<th>Local Visitors</th>
<th>Foreign Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngwe Saung</td>
<td>54,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jan-Oct, 2016</th>
<th>Local Visitors</th>
<th>Foreign Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ngwe Saung</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>21,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Global New Light of Myanmar Newspaper
Table 2: Estimated\textsuperscript{17} visitors to Gaw Yan Gyi island

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bungalow Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Estimated Visitors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>From</td>
<td>To</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bungalow (1)</td>
<td>1-Dec-16</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bungalow (2)</td>
<td>1-Dec-16</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Bungalow (3)</td>
<td>1-Nov-16</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bungalow (4)</td>
<td>1-Feb-15</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bungalow (5)</td>
<td>1-Jan-17</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Bungalow (6)</td>
<td>1-Jan-16</td>
<td>31-Mar-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.1 Key Opportunities

- CBT can be used as an economic development tool for rural economies as it provides local people with job opportunities and extra income

- It can also provide new opportunities for sustaining the natural environment and preserving local culture and heritage.

- Ngayokekaung area would become the first CBT initiative in Ayeyarwaddy Region.

- Community Involvement in Tourism (CIT) policy will be applied by allowing community-based tourism in Ngayokeakung area and the degree of participation of the local people will be significantly improved.

- Willingness of the local community for the development of CBT is present and needs to be matched by providing capacity for human resource development and budgetary support from the regional government.

6.2 Key Challenges.

- Lack of good transportation and communication systems in the area

- Lack of experience when it comes to tourism and related services

- Lack of knowledge about budgeting and basic management skills

- Lack of well-developed human resources for CBT in the area.

- Lack of technical knowledge and assistance in transforming local raw materials into final products

- Lack of cooperation for the development of CBT from regional government officials

\textsuperscript{17} The data are estimated from Bungalow owners as they do not keep proper visitor records.
### 6.3. SWOC Analysis of Ngayokekaung CBT Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Constraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Local people are very enthusiastic to conserve their natural environment and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>• Not all local people have knowledge of CBT and its related activities</td>
<td>• Local people are willing to cooperate with all stakeholders for the development of CBT in their area.</td>
<td>• Potential deep water harbour plan and other industrial development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local inhabitants are willing to initiate CBT in their area.</td>
<td>• Majority of the land in the area has been sold.</td>
<td>• Ngayokekaung area is identified as a potential tourism destination by the national level government</td>
<td>• Logistic hub for the offshore gas and oil in Ngayokekaung area is under reviewed by regional parliamentarians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Natural beauty will attract travellers and tourists</td>
<td>• Road conditions are poor across the region and communication is not accessible to all villages</td>
<td>• Ngayokekaung region could be marketed as a niche beach destination.</td>
<td>• Environmental degradation and pollution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local people have a strong organizing and mobilizing skills</td>
<td>• Only generators are available in villages across Ngayokekaung.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Recommendations

To the residents of Ngayokekaung

• Organization of CBT to acquire legal compliance and recognition from the government.

• Set up Information and Welcome Center as a first step for CBT initiatives

• Promote as a unified body and attract adventure travelers such as bikers, campers, hikers and nature lovers to carve a specific market among those groups

• Educate the community and equip members with basic financial, hospitality and logistics management skills

• Establish an agreed mechanism (e.g. 5% out of profit) to share the benefits within local community

To the regional government

• Prioritize investment in basic infrastructure (such as transportation and communication infrastructure) for the planning and implementation of CBT as well as to initiate local economic development.

• Provide adequate social services such as schools and clinics for the local community across Ngayokekaung area

• Provide financial assistance to local residents so that they can prepare for basic necessities such as toilets and bathrooms in order to be able to host guests and visitors

• Grant legal ownership documents for house ownerships in Ngayokekaung area in order to receive loans from financial institutions and private sector investors.

• Encourage private investors and business people to establish cooperation with the local community in line with the requirements recommended in CIT policy

• Set a concrete investment policy framework for incoming private investment

To NGO and private investors

• Invest in building small bungalows utilizing the local materials and resources for visitors and help the local residents generate income by employing them: planning and forecasting of finance and human resource needs are key.

• Establish joint venture with the local people in line with the requirements of CIT policy so that the benefit can be shared equally.

• Provide skills and tourism related training (e.g. hospitality and housekeeping) to the local people

8. Conclusion

As the number of international tourists continues to increase annually, many more destinations for visitors will need to be explored in Myanmar. Meanwhile, as the GDP of the country is also predicted to increase gradually year on year, domestic visitors from urban area will make visits throughout the country for recreation and will look for places like Ngayokekaung which upholds eco-friendly tourism and provides a relaxing place for them to release stress and enjoy nature. Thus, the government needs to encourage the kind of tourism which helps the community access more benefits, conserves the environment and cultural heritage and enhances the livelihood of the local people.
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Appendix 1: Follow Up Visitor Survey Findings and Analysis

Visitor survey were conducted during the water festival period (11 - 17 April, 2017) in order to understand the opinion of the visitor visiting to Gaw Yan Gyi Island and the following graphs represents the findings and the analysis is followed.

**Q.1 How did you get information about Gaw Yan Gyi?**
- Travel Agency: 32%
- Internet: 17%
- Family/Friends: 51%

**Q.2 How many times have you visited Gaw Yan Gyi Island before?**
- None: 10%
- Once: 2%
- More than three times: 88%

**Q.3 What was the reason of your holidays in Gaw Yan Gyi Island?**
- Beach holiday: 10%
- Family visit: 15%
- Religious trip: 10%
- Eco-tourism: 3%
- Other: 62%

**Q.4 Did your trip to Gaw Yan Gyi Island meet your expectations?**
- Absolutely not: 7%
- Partly: 54%
- Completely: 39%

**Q.5 How long did you stay in Gaw Yan Gyi Island?**
- 1-3 days: 7%
- 4-6 days: 3%
- More than a week: 90%

**Q.6 What kind of accommodation did you stay in?**
- Hotel: 5%
- Bungalow: 15%
- Homestay: 39%
- Friends/ Family: 41%
Q.7 How much did you spend for the accommodation per day?
- Under 20000 Kyats: 5%
- 20001 Kyats to 30000 Kyats: 35%
- 30001 Kyats to 40000 Kyats: 55%
- Over 50000 Kyats: 5%

Q.8 How much did you spend for food per day?
- Under 10000 Kyats: 7%
- 10001 Kyats to 20000 Kyats: 8%
- 20001 Kyats to 30000 Kyats: 20%
- Over 30000 Kyats: 65%

Q.9 What transportation did you use to come to Gaw Yan Gyi Island?
- Own Car: 17%
- Bus: 49%
- Other: 34%

Q.10 Would you like to visit Gaw Yan Gyi Island again?
- No: 5%
- I do not know: 53%
- Yes: 42%

Q.11A Overall beach quality
- Average: 13%
- Good: 18%
- Very Good: 59%

Q.11B. Beach cleanliness
- Poor: 5%
- Average: 10%
- Good: 23%
- Very Good: 59%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How did you get information about Gaw Yan Gyi?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many times have you visited Gaw Yan Gyi?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the purpose of your trip to Gaw Yan Gyi?</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your trip to Gaw Yan Gyi Island meet your expectations?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long did you stay in Gaw Yan Gyi?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What kind of accommodation did you stay in?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you spend on the accommodation per day?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How much did you spend on food per day?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you travel to Gaw Yan Gyi?</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you like to visit Gaw Yan Gyi again?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall beach quality</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach cleanliness</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach signs and information</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to the beach</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security/ safety</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to information to visitors</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care facilities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your age group?</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is your employment status</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Visitor Survey Analysis

The survey was conducted with visitors to Gaw Yan Gyi Island which is in Zone 2, NgaYokeKaung, during a field trip from April 11th to 17th using a written questionnaire. Although the sample size of 42 is limited, the result provides an insight into visitors’ viewpoints about ongoing CBT project in Ngayokekaung highlighting some of its strengths and weaknesses.

Answers showed that Gaw Yan Gyi Island has a high reputation. Surprisingly, over 50% of interviewees responded that their trip met their expectations completely, and nearly 40% answered partly. Although 36 people out of 40 have never visited Gaw Yan Gyi before, more than half of the responders answered that they would like to come back to the area. Visitors assessed several elements on a five-point scale, and specifically beach quality and overall satisfaction are high at 3.26 and 3.56. These show that tourism in Gaw Yan Gyi Island is attractive for tourists, and possesses a high potential to succeed.

However, the results also exposed a problem; lack of beach signs and information, whose average mark was 1.71. Although some visitors did not complain about the absence of lifeguards or security on the beach, this, combined with the absence of proper signage is an issue for the success of CBT. The response regarding health care facilities confirms the widely-held community view that these are inadequate.

The main source of information about Gaw Yan Gyi is the internet, and this is directly related to the fact that approximately 80% of the visitors are under 30 years old, with none of them being over 50 years old. One of the reasons for this is transportation: visitors must take several means of transport including motor bike and boat from Ngayokekaung to Gaw Yan Gi. Also, the road to Gaw Yan Gi is rough and potholed, thus the trip is exhausting.
Appendix 2: AD’s engagement timeline and activities with people from Ngayokekaung Region

1. Community-Based Tourism Talk
   Date: 7th April to 8th April 2016

2. Meeting with Regional Government, Regional Parliament member and National Parliament members
   Date: 14th June 2016

3. Research Assessment for Community-Based Tourism
   Date: 15th June 2016 to 21 June 2016

4. Exposure Trips To Thandaunggyi and Myaing
   Date: 26th September and 24th October 2016

5. Feasibility Assessment of local products and introduction to Pomelo social enterprise
   Date: 3th October to 5th October 2016

6. CBT Workshop in Kwai Chai village
   Date: 29th October to 30th October 2016

7. Community-Based Tourism Discussion
   Date: 12th December 2016

8. Assessment of local participation in CBT and the progress in each group
   Date: 10th March to 17th March 2017

9. Information Center Construction
   Date: March, 2017

10. Visitor Survey
   Date: 11th April to 17th April 2017

11. Skilled-Up Training (Zone 2)
    Date: 3rd April to 4th April 2017

12. Skilled-Up Training (Zone 1)
    Date: 1st May to 2nd May 2017

13. Skilled-Up Training (Zone 3)
    Date: 3rd May to 4th May 2017

14. Exposure Trips to Pa-O and Thandaunggyi
    Date: 22th to 25th May 2017

15. Sharing session on Excursions
    Date: 26th May 2017

16. CBT committee meeting and development of advocacy materials
    Date: 11th to 16th July, 2017
Date:
3rd to 5th October, 2016

Trip Objective:

To conduct an assessment on local products in Ngayokekaung and introduce them to Pomelo Social Enterprise. Discuss how to improve and add value to local products to be able to sell on local and international markets.

Activities:

AD team and Pomelo’s designer went around the region and met local people who are interested in handicrafts and who are expert at making or producing them. Pomelo staff presented the organization and showed handicrafts from different parts of the world. There followed a question and answer session in which many local people were actively involved. They came and showed their existing handicrafts to Pomelo and explored creative ideas facilitated by AD. Local handicraft experts organized themselves into nine groups and chose organizers for them.

Future Plan: Local products are sold in Pomelo and elsewhere.
Date:

29th October to 30th October, 2016

Trip Objective:

To deliver a workshop and to form working committees for CBT

Activities:

The local organizer arranged the venue and invited 10 people from each village tract to come to this workshop to be able to cover the whole region. There were nearly 140 representatives in attendance. Municipal officials, the director of Future Green Organization, a volunteer from Myat Nander Development Organization (Ngwe Shaung), the field coordinator of MATA (Pathein) and Eleven Media Group and Than Taw Sint Media also attended this workshop. The official from Ngayokekaung municipality emphasized the common aim for government, local communities and non-governmental organizations, stressing the opportunity to be different from other resorts in the Region.

AD gave a presentation about the criteria for CBT and ran a question and answer session. Local people asked how to share the benefit fairly, the definition of community, and the steps needed to accommodate visitors. Those people who had visited Thandaunggyi and Myaing CBT schemes shared their experiences with the workshop participants.

AD facilitated the formation of working groups: destination management; environmental conservation, and stakeholder engagement. To implement CBT, the whole region was divided into three zones with each having the above three working groups.

Future Plan:

AD is to provide technical assistance to working groups’ TORs and function.

Three geographical zones were identified as CBT areas for Ngayokekaung. In Zone One, Thae Phyu, Thit Yaung, Moe Tain Pyin and Ye Kyaw village tracts are included. Ngayokekaung wards 1 and 2, Nanthapu and Kwai Chai village tracts are involved in Zone Two. Nat Maw Sapagy, Pan Maw and Kwing Bat village tracts are included in Zone Three. In addition, CBT working groups and three subcommittees namely: environmental conservation, destination management and stakeholder engagement subcommittees were formed and terms of references for each were also developed. 22 representatives for working groups and 72 representatives for each subcommittee were also selected through consensus from the respective villages involved. Civil society organizations including Another Development (AD), the local administrator from the General Administrative Department, Land Records Department and the Municipality are to play a technical assistance role. The detailed structure of the CBT zones and its subcommittee is illustrated as follows:
Structure of CBT Working Group and its Subcommittee

Ngayokekaung CBT Working Group

Technical and Advisory Groups
Another Development (AD), GAD, Municipal, Land Records Department Affair

Zone 1
Thel Phyu Village
Thit Yaung Village
Moe Tein Pyin Village
Yay Kyaw Village

Zone 2
Ngayokekaung Ward 1,2
Nantharpu Village
Kway Chai Village

Zone 3
Nat Maw Village
Sabar Gyi Village
Pan Maw Village
Kwin Bat Village

Destinations Management Sub-Committee
Destinations Management Sub-Committee
Destinations Management Sub-Committee

Environmental Conservation Sub-Committee
Environmental Conservation Sub-Committee
Environmental Conservation Sub-Committee

Stakeholder Engagement Sub-Committee
Stakeholder Engagement Sub-Committee
Stakeholder Engagement Sub-Committee
The Ngayokekaung CBT working group sits above the three subcommittee with representatives from the three different zones (some technical persons are also involved in the working group). Since each zone has three different subcommittee, they will work independently in respective zone. However, when it comes to making policy, representatives of same subcommittee from different zones will come together, discuss and make decisions for their respective subcommittees. For example, representatives of the destinations management subcommittee from different zones will meet and discuss the policy for their subcommittee and further improvements for CBT across Ngayokekaung. The same procedure applies to the other two subcommittees. Details of the terms of reference for each subcommittee are attached.

**TORs for Destinations Management Subcommittees**

1. To establish a tourism information center for visitors
2. To erect sign posts in necessary places
3. To plan activities for preserving local culture
4. To set the standards for guest houses and home stays in accordance with the rules, regulations and international practice
5. To release instructions related to tourism as necessary
6. To set the standards for restaurants and display them
7. To plan for the security and wellbeing of visitors
8. To arrange tourism-related service courses and training for local people
9. To set up easy transfer systems
10. To develop and manage destinations for the visitors
11. To guide visitors to indigenous places

**TORs for Stakeholder Engagement Subcommittees**

1. To cooperate with relevant government departments
2. To coordinate with tour agencies
3. To negotiate on transportation charges with the local people
4. To coordinate with reception services for hosting visitors
5. To connect with civil society organizations and experts
6. To ensure local business operators and private business people follow agreed practices
7. To network with the media

**TORs for Environmental Conservation Subcommittees**

1. To conduct activities for environmental conservation
2. To arrange for systematic disposal of waste, sewage and rubbish
3. To ensure the conservation of publicly-owned forests, water sources, mangroves, coral reefs and beaches
4. To limit noise and air pollution
5. To conserve and maintain bird and animal life
Date:

10\textsuperscript{th} to 17\textsuperscript{th} March, 2017

Trip Objective:

To assess progress on CBT with Paung Ku and discuss setting up an Information Center.

Activities:

Together we visited eight villages to discuss progress in CBT. We were pleasantly surprised to find that 90 percent of participants in Kwin Bat’s meeting were women. Paung Ku’s purpose in visiting the area was to assess the level of community understanding of CBT and the degree of commitment to taking the work forward. Having ascertained that the community engagement was strong, Paung Ku agreed to fund the establishment of an Information Center. We suggested that they attract visitors who are at the moment only focusing on Gaw Yan Gyi Island. They were interested but worried about the transportation barriers. In Kyway chaing village, we suggested the need to consider waste management and tackle sustainability.

Future Plan:

To establish and support a functioning Information Center.
Date:

11\textsuperscript{th} to 17\textsuperscript{th} April, 2017

Trip Objective:

To survey Thingyan holiday visitors and to monitor progress of the Information Center construction.

Activities:

Conduct interviews and survey visitors (severely curtailed due to Cyclone Marutha); visit completed Information Center and identify current challenges:-

- Poor transportation facilities
- Overcharging
- No one willing to collect waste materials
- No security measures supplied by Ngayokekaung GAD despite community request
Visitor Survey Questions

Our priority is that visitors enjoy their stay. We hope that a better experience will be achieved with the cooperation of visitors. Please help us by answering the following questions.

1. How did you get information about Gaw Yan Gyi? (More than one answer allowed)
   - Travel agency □
   - Internet □
   - Family/friends □
   - Travel brochures □
   - Newspapers/magazines □
   - Other: ______________________________

2. How many times have you visited Gaw Yan Gyi?
   - None □
   - Once □
   - Twice □
   - Over 3 times □

3. What was the purpose of your trip to Gaw Yan Gyi island? (More than one answer allowed)
   - Beach holiday □
   - Family visit □
   - Religious trip □
   - Eco-tourism □
   - Other: _______

4. Did your trip to Gaw Yan Gyi meet your expectations?
   - Completely □
   - Partly □
   - Absolutely not □

5. How long did you stay in Gaw Yan Gyi?
   - 1-3 days □
   - 4 - 6 days □
   - More than a week □

6. What kind of accommodation did you stay in? (More than one answer allowed)
   - Hotel □
   - Bungalow □
   - Homestay □
   - Friends/ Family □
   - Other: ____________________

7. How much did you spend on the accommodation per day?
   - Under 20000 Kyats □
   - 20001 to 30000 Kyats □
   - 30001 to 40000 Kyats □
   - 40001 to 50000 Kyats □
   - Over 50000 Kyats □
8. How much did you spend on food per day?
Under 10000 Kyats  □  10001 to 20000 Kyats  □
20001 to 30000 Kyats  □  Over 30000 Kyats  □

9. How did you travel to Gaw Yan Gyi?
Own car  □  Bus  □  Other: _____________________________________________________

10. Would you like to visit Gaw Yan Gyi island again?
Yes  □  No  □  I don’t know  □

11. Please evaluate the quality of our beach.
1: Poor  2: Average  3: Good  4: Very Good  5: Excellent
Overall beach quality
Beach cleanliness
Beach signs and information
Access to the beach
Security/safety
Access to information for visitor
Overall satisfaction
Health care facilities

12. What is your age group?
Up to 18 years  □  18-24 years  □  25-29 years  □  30-34 years  □
35-39 years  □  40-44 years  □  45-49 years  □  50-54 years  □
55-59 years  □  Over 60 years  □

13. What is your employment status?
Student  □  Self-employed  □  Employed  □  part-time  □
Unemployed  □  Retired  □

Thank you very much for your cooperation!
Date:

3rd to 4th April, 2017 (Jaing Lay village) 1st to 2nd May, 2017 (Thit Yaing village) 4th to 5th May, 2017 (Ngan Chaung village)

Trip Objective:

To increase the skills of bungalow, Homestay and B&B managers, enabling them to initiate CBT activities

Activities:

Key infrastructural needs; hospitality traits; dealing with waste products; house and beach safety requirements, and handicrafts production and sales.

Future Plan:

Waste disposal system, rules about violations of ‘no litter rule’.

AD team and local participant at Hospitality Training
Discussion on Hospitality Training

Discussion Point
Date:
22nd to 25th May, 2017

Field Trip Objective:
To expose Ngayokekaung residents to CBT in Pa-O Self-Administered Zone and to strengthen the links to CITPAR (Community Involved Tourism Pa-O Region) and GIZ, a German Development Agency.

Activities:

• Visit local attractions,
• Visit handicrafts production
• Attend cultural performances.
Date:
26th May, 2017

Meeting Objective:
To share the experiences and knowledge gained from the excursions to Pa-O Zone and Thandaunggyi.

Activities:
Presentations were made covering the following points

1. Describe the situation of the region you visited.
2. Describe the operating system of CBT you observed.
3. What did you learn from the excursion? Describe its strengths and weaknesses.
4. What will you do when you get back to your region?
5. How will you adapt CBT to Ngayokekaung?
6. Which challenges will you face? How will you overcome them?
7. What kind of support do you need?

Future Plan:

- Community mobilization
- Environmental conservation including mangroves
- Focus on traditional culture
- Fend off mega-projects
- Build community unity and participation
Date:
11th to 12th July 2017

Agenda

1. Evaluation of CBT committee
   • Work done
   • Achievements
   • Work plan
   • Community forums
   • Local products
   • Signage and directions
   • Next steps

2. AD’s Engagement
   • Background to AD’s involvement and role in Ngayokekaung
   • Community Views on AD

3. Information Center
   • Progress
   • Who are responsible persons
   • Display materials
   • How to share the benefits of CBT
   • Next steps

4. How to engage with Regional Government
   • Proposal to Regional Government
   • Advocacy to national government

5. Exchange visit sharing

6. Responsible Tourism and Community Involvement Tourism (CIT)

AOB
AD (Another Development) was set up in 2015 specifically to address some of the problems besetting Myanmar society in the new era and to advocate for public policy improvements. We are an independent not-for-profit policy institute.

**Contact Info:**

**Address:** No. 62, 5th Floor, Nyaung Tone Street, Sanchaung Township, Yangon, Myanmar  
**Phone:** +95 (9) 566 1508, +95 (1) 521313  
**Email:** anotherdevelopment.office@gmail.com  
**Facebook:** https://m.facebook.com/anotherdevelopmentAD/